

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicant will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

Objections

Specification

The specification stands objected to because of a number of informalities and inconsistencies. Since the specification has been amended (and since Figure 1 has been amended to ensure consistency with the specification), based on the Examiner's helpful comments, this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to the title as not being descriptive. Since the title has been amended and is now descriptive of the invention to which the claims are directed, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims

Claims 3, 4, and 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Since claims 3, 7 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form to include the elements of base claim 1, these claims are now in condition for allowance. Since claims 8 and 10 depend from claims 7 and 9, respectively, these claims are similarly now in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,351,287 ("the Sakaegi patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,849 ("the McIntyre patent"). The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Independent claim 1, as amended to include the recitation of claim 2, is not rendered obvious by the Sakaegi and McIntyre patents because these patents, either taken alone, or in combination, neither teach, nor suggest, a camera with a print section having a luminescence section to expose a photosensitive form based on image information obtained by an electronic imaging section of the camera. Claim 1 is reprinted below with this feature depicted in bold typeface:

An electronic camera comprising:
an electronic imaging section
which performs a photoelectron
conversion of a subject image to
generate an electric image
information;
a print section to print an
image obtained from the image
information by said electronic
imaging section on a printing paper;
a record section to record the
image information by said electronic
imaging section on a record medium;
a mode select section to select
one camera mode from among a
plurality of camera modes;
a power supply remainder
detection section to detect a
remainder to be able to supply the
power supply; and
a power supply remainder
judgment section to set a level
necessary for executing an operation
corresponding to a camera mode
selected by said mode select section
according to each of said plurality
of modes and to judge whether a
detected remainder is equal to or
larger than a setting level, wherein
said **print section has a**
luminescence section to expose a
photosensitive form based on the
image information obtained by said
electronic imaging section and a
transportation section to transport a
photosensitive form. [Emphasis
added.]

This feature is now discussed.

The Examiner concedes that the Sakaegi patent does not disclose a print section. To compensate for this admitted deficiency, the Examiner relies on the McIntyre patent. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the McIntyre patent discloses a camera with an integrated printer, whether the print section prints an image obtained from the image information by an electronic image section on a printing paper. (See Paper No. 5,

page 4.) With reference to claims 2 and 6, the Examiner contends that in the McIntyre patent, the print section 13 has a luminance section 37 to expose a photosensitive form 30. (Paper No. 5, page 6.) The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The McIntyre patent has a print section that uses a thermal head 37 to transfer colorant from a donor to a receiver. (See, e.g., column 6, lines 35-47). Such a thermal head, used for heat transfer printing, neither teaches, nor suggests, a luminance section to expose a photosensitive form. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is not rendered obvious by the Sakaegi and McIntyre patents for at least this reason. Since claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 6 depends from claim 5, these claims are similarly not rendered obvious by these patents.

New claims

New independent claim 13 and dependent claim 14 include a built-in printer section including a diffusion transfer reversal process printer. These claims are believed to be patentable because neither the Sakaegi patent, nor the McIntyre patent, either taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest this feature.

Amendments to the Specification and Drawings

The specification has been amended, and changes to the drawings have been proposed, to correct a number of minor errors.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicant requests that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2004


John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **August 10, 2004** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


John C. Pokotylo

36,242
Reg. No.